



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/867,679	05/31/2001	Martin John Millmore	19111.0057	7209
68009	7590	01/08/2008	EXAMINER	
BINGHAM MCCUTCHEN, LLP			AMINI, JAVID A	
2020 K STREET, NW				
BOX IP			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20006			2628	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			01/08/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/867,679	MILLMORE ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Javid A. Amini	2628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10/23/2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

In response to Applicant's amendment to claim 2, the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite has been withdrawn.

In response to Applicant's amendment to claims 1-2, the claim objections have been withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 10/23/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Note: The Examiner's responses are written in italic format, see below:

In response to Applicant's argument (pages 6-7 of the remarks) that claims 3 and 10-15 are not unpatentable over Day in view of Kennedy. The combination of Day and Kennedy does not disclose or suggest in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values (*the Examiner is respectfully disagreed with Applicant's argument because, the reference Day teaches the data entry form (30) having at least one data entry field (Fig. 3, entry field 41), wherein a user can inserts the word "CONVERTIBLE" model for the entry field (41). As shown in Fig. 4, upon inserts the name "CONVERTIBLE", the form entry system dynamically altering the data entry form and the display of the data entry form by highlighting the next filed and bring up the corresponding tool (50) to fill in that field (Column 3, line 63 to column 4, line 2)), and (Kennedy teaches a profile generator function (205c) extracts the name, address, and phone number entered by the user, fills out the corresponding*

fields in auto fill profiled (203) by matching field labels in form (250) with those in auto fill profile (203), and prompts the user to fill in missing data items such as e-mail), displaying the at least one further data entry field that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the at least one further data entry field (When the user has completed the user profiled, the completed form is saved and used as the basis for populating future forms (Column 6, lines 50-58). Kennedy further teaches "In accordance with one aspect of the present invention, data values for the fields that were filled in by the user in Fig. 4 are extracted, matched with the fields in the auto fill profile, and presented to the user as shown in Fig. 6" (Column 8, lines 27-31)).

In response to Applicant's argument (see last paragraph on page 7 of the remarks) that the reference Day does not disclose or suggest in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the at least one further data entry field that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the at least one further data entry field, as is required by claim 3, Examiner is respectfully disagreed with Applicant's argument because, (The reference Day teaches the data entry form (30) having at least one data entry field (Fig. 3, entry field 41), wherein a user can inserts the word "CONVERTIBLE" model for the entry field (41). As shown in Fig. 4, upon inserts the name "CONVERTIBLE", the form entry system dynamically altering the data entry form and the display of the data entry form by highlighting the next filed and bring up the corresponding tool (50) to fill in that field (Column 3, line 63 to column 4, line 2)).

In response to Applicant's argument, (see page 8 of the remarks) the matching disclosed by Kennedy involves matching data values for fields that were filled in by the user with fields in the autofill profile, in order to populate those fields in the autofill profile with the values filled in by the user. (*Examiner's interpretations: it is obvious that the autofill profile is constructed by program instructions, and these instructions are written by a user as a programmer*).

In response to Applicant's argument, (see page 9 of the remarks) Kennedy does not disclose or suggest in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the at least one further data entry field that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the at least one further data entry field, as is required by claim 3. *The Examiner is respectfully disagreed with Applicant's argument because, (Kennedy teaches a profile generator function (205c) extracts the name, address, and phone number entered by the user, fills out the corresponding fields in auto fill profiled (203) by matching field labels in form (250) with those in auto fill profile (203), and prompts the user to fill in missing data items such as e-mail. When the user has completed the user profiled, the completed form is saved and used as the basis for populating future forms (Column 6, lines 50-58). Kennedy further teaches "In accordance with one aspect of the his invention, data values for the fields that were filled in by the user in Fig. 4 are extracted, matched with the fields in the auto fill profile, and presented to the user as shown in Fig. 6" (Column 8, lines 27-31)).*

In response to Applicant's argument, (see page 10 of the remarks) Kennedy does not disclose or suggest displaying anything based on a value that is entered matching a stored value. *The Examiner is respectfully disagreed with Applicant's argument because, data values for the fields that were filled in by the user in Fig. 4 are extracted, matched with the fields in the auto fill profile, and presented to the user as shown in Fig. 6"*
(Column 8, lines 27-31)

In response to Applicant's argument (pages 10-12), Day, Kennedy and Nishiyama do not disclose or suggest in response to entry of a value into the at least one data entry field that matches one of the plurality of stored data values, displaying the at least one further data entry field that corresponds to the value entered into the at least one data entry field according to the attribute data defining the at least one further data entry field, *The examiner respectfully disagreed with Applicant's argument because the reference Nishiyama is not part of the rejection in previous Office Action dated 4/23/2007, and Examiner has responded (see above) to Applicant's argument regarding the references Day and Kennedy.*

The previous rejection of claims 1-15 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) is still maintained, and Examiner encourages Applicant to schedule an interview.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Day, Jr. et al (4,763,356) (hereinafter Day) in view Kennedy et al (6,651,217)

Regarding claim 3, Day discloses (Figs. 3 and 4) a computer-implemented system for controlling the appearance of a data entry form on a display (form 30 on a display 15). The method comprises the step of causing a data entry form (30) to be displayed on a display (15) in accordance with stored attributes (highlighted attribute) (Column 3, lines 47-51). The data entry form (30) having at least one data entry field (Fig. 3, entry field 41), wherein a user can inserts the word "CONVERTIBLE" model for the entry field (41). As shown in Fig. 4, upon inserts the name "CONVERTIBLE", the form entry system dynamically altering the data entry form and the display of the data entry form by highlighting the next filed and bring up the corresponding tool (50) to fill in that field (Column 3, line 63 to column 4, line 2).

However, Day fails to explicitly specify the step of monitoring data values entered into the at least one data entry field (Claim 3, lines 8-9).

Thus, it would have been to a person of ordinary skill in the art to recognize that the form entry system of Day would monitor which car model, such as roadster (42), 4 DR. sedan (43), etc. being entered and change the tool menu responsively to the user's

selection. Kennedy (6,651,217), on the other hand, discloses (Fig. 2) a user of client computer (204) visits web site (201) and enters his name, address, and telephone number into form (250), modified web browser (205) associates the values entered by the user with field labels appearing near the values and stores the values into a data structure (206) for future use (Column 6, lines 23-29). Kennedy further discloses a profile generator function (205c) extracts the name, address, and phone number entered by the user, fills out the corresponding fields in auto fill profiled (203) by matching field labels in form (250) with those in auto fill profile (203), and prompts the user to fill in missing data items such as e-mail. When the user has completed the user profiled, the completed form is saved and used as the basis for populating future forms (Column 6, lines 50-58). Kennedy further teaches "In accordance with one aspect of the present invention, data values for the fields that were filled in by the user in Fig. 4 are extracted, matched with the fields in the auto fill profile, and presented to the user as shown in Fig. 6" (Column 8, lines 27-31).

Thus, based on this teaching, the form entry system of Kennedy monitors the data values entered by the user, such as his name, address, and telephone number.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art to use the monitoring or matching processed of Kennedy into the form entry system of Day to create a profile generator for storing the car buyer profile for future use.

Regarding claim 1, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 3.

Regarding claim 2, Kennedy discloses (fig. 2) the controller (client computer 204) is configured to enable a user to define the content of the store (Profile generator 205c defines the content of the stored data).

Regarding claim 4, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 10.

Regarding claim 5, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 11.

Regarding claim 6, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claim 12.

Regarding claims 7-9, note the rejection as set forth above with respect to claims 13-15.

Regarding claims 10 and 12, Day discloses (Figs. 8-9) a corresponding further data entry field (fields 85-1 to 85-7) is an address entry field having a correct format for the address style data value (the dealer address style data value). See column 5, lines 48-58.

On the other hand, Kennedy also discloses (Figs. 7 and 8) a corresponding further data entry field is an address entry field having a correct format for the address style data value (the highlighted auto fill address style).

Regarding claim 11, Kennedy discloses (Figs. 7 and 8) the corresponding further data entry filed corresponds in form with the data value entered into one data entry field. Figs. 7 and 8 shows different form styles with certain fields highlighted to indicate that they contain automatically suggested values. See column 8, line 54 to column 9, line 13.

Regarding claim 13, Day discloses (Figs. 8-9) wherein the controller (computer 20) further displays a corresponding plurality of further data entry field (fields 85-1 to 85-7) according to the stored attribute data (the dealer address attribute data values). See column 5, lines 48-58. On the other hand, Kennedy also discloses (Figs. 7 and 8) a corresponding plurality of further data entry fields according to the stored attribute data (the highlighted auto fill attribute data).

Regarding claim 14, Kennedy discloses (Figs. 7 and 8) a corresponding plurality of further data entry fields correspond in form with the data value entered into the one data entry field. Figs. 7 and 8 shows different form styles with certain plurality of fields highlighted to indicate that they contain automatically suggested values. See column 8, line 54 to column 9, line 13.

Regarding claim 15, Day discloses (Figs. 8-9) a corresponding further data entry field (fields 85-1 to 85-7) indicating a style (the dealer information address style) and the corresponding plurality of further data entry fields (fields 85-1 to 85-7) have correct formats for the indicated style (the dealer address style data value). See column 5, lines 48-58. On the other hand, Kennedy discloses (Figs. 7 and 8) a corresponding further data entry fields having a correct format for the address style data value (the highlighted auto fill address style).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the

advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Javid A. Amini whose telephone number is 571-272-7654. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kee Tung can be reached on 571-272-7794. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Javid A Amini
Examiner
Art Unit 2628

J.A.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Javid A. Amini". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized "J" at the beginning.